

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 13 are pending in this case.

Independent claims 1, 10, 11 and 13 recite that the interference system as therein defined is for the satellite payload and therewith not directed to earth stations in a satellite communication system that has means for canceling received return signals...

Further the claims now recite that there are two antennas present in the claimed system – a first antenna which is used to receive communication signals from a first source, for example, a mobile phone, and a second antenna which is used to receive an interference reference signal from a second source, for example, a base tower. The application paragraphs 0005, 0027 etc., the drawings – Figs. 3 and 4 clearly show the second antenna and its purpose.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishida.

It is of interest to note that the interference cancellation system and method taught by Ishida is entirely devoted to earth stations in a satellite communications system that has means for canceling received return signal due to the local transmission signal so as to result in the desired signal transmitted from a second earth station via the satellite (emphasis ours). There is no teaching or suggestion of such an interference cancellation system for the satellite payload.

Claim 1 (and claims 2-9 that depend from claim 1), 10 and 11 contain specification limitations that the system and method are related to the interference cancellation on a satellite payload.

Ishida does not teach the use of first and second antennas and how they interact to treat signals from different sources to produce a signal for transmission to a ground based terminal resulting in improved performance of the satellite payload by accurately canceling the interference in the communication signals.

The limitation is in all of the claims presented for consideration by virtue of its inclusion in all of the independent claims.

The claims as noted above recite that the interference cancellation system is for the satellite payload and that multiple antenna associated with different signal sources are involved.

The rejection of all of the claims (35 U.S.C. 102(b)) over Ishida should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: December 18, 2006

/Joshua S. Broitman/
Joshua S. Broitman
Registration No. 38,006
Evelyn M. Sommer
Registration No. 19, 603
OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY AND
BROITMAN, PC
250 Park Avenue, Suite 825
New York, NY 10177
Phone: (212) 681-0600
Customer Number: 64722